

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/083,568	•	02/27/2002	William C. Benavitz	A8130.0078/P078 5899		
24998	7590	09/21/2004		EXAMINER		
DICKSTE	DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP				DAWSON, GLENN K	
2101 L STR WASHING		20037-1526		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
	,			3731		
				DATE MAILED: 09/21/200	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<del>-1/-</del> -		
	10/083,568	BENAVITZ ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Glenn K Dawson	3731			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	33 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acco					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• ,	• •			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		• •			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 3731

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fucci, et al.-5827291.

Fucci discloses a plication driver having a cannulated shaft 12, a handle 80, a recess 14 and a slot 77 in the wall of the shaft which receives the suture.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 3731

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Burkhart, et al.-6641597 in view of either Grafton, et al.-5964783 or Grafton, et al.-0916312.

Burkhart discloses a push in anchor having ribs and an insert molded suture in the anchor body. It is believed to be inherent in this description that a polymer must be placed into a mold with the suture therein to manufacture the device. However, absent a finding of inherency of this feature, the examiner turns to either Grafton reference which discloses a method of forming a suture anchor where a polymer is injected into a mold with a suture therein and the polymer cures to attach the suture to the anchor. It would have been obvious to have manufactured the insert molded suture anchor of Burkhart using the manufacturing method disclosed by Grafton, in order to easily produce a strong suture anchor where the suture is reliably retained within the body of the anchor.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkhart, et al.-6641597 in view of Grafton, et al.-0916312 or Grafton, et al.-5964783, and further in view of Fucci-'291.

Burkhart, et al in view of either Grafton reference makes obvious the invention as claimed with the exception of the suture exiting the side of the plication driver. Fucci discloses a plication driver having a cannulated shaft 12, a handle 80, a recess 14 and a slot 77 in the wall of the shaft which receives the suture. It would have been obvious

Art Unit: 3731

to have used a driver such as that disclosed by Fucci to drive the suture anchor of Burkhart into bone, as this driver has proven efficient at providing enough force to drive the anchor into the bone while providing a means fro routing the suture through the cannulated shaft of the driver.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fucci-'291 in view of Burkhart, et al.-'597 or Grafton,-'312 or --'783.

Fucci discloses the invention as claimed with the exception of the suture anchor being insert molded. Burkhart, Grafton and Grafton all disclose the insert molding of a suture anchor. It would have been obvious to have used an insert molded suture anchor with the driver of Fucci, as Fucci discloses in col. 4 lines 32-34 that the driver can insert push in anchors as shown in fig. 3a, and as noted above, using an insert molded anchor easily produces a strong suture anchor where the suture is reliably retained within the body of the anchor.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenn K Dawson whose telephone number is 703-308-4304. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anhtuan T. Nguyen can be reached on 703-308-2154. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/083,568

Art Unit: 3731

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Glenn K Dawson Primary Examiner Art Unit 3731 Page 5

Gkd 19 September 2004